United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
20 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(*Item 3 (b)*)

Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/AC.51/2013/5)

1. At its seventh and ninth meetings, on 6 and 11 June 2013, the Committee had before it the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/AC.51/2013/5).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and representatives of OIOS and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) responded to questions raised by the Committee on procedural issues.

Discussion

3. Many delegations raised procedural questions regarding the submission of a report that was not consistent with the recommendation contained in paragraph 66 of the previous report of the Committee (A/66/16), which had been endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/8. Delegations therefore questioned whether the Committee should consider the report, regardless of whether it was interesting or useful.

4. Clarification was sought regarding why the mandated report had not been produced. Following the responses provided by the Secretariat and, notably, the interpretation as to the authority for such a programme evaluation of UNHCR, a

Please recycle

number of delegations expressed the view that there needed to be coordination between OIOS and UNHCR so that the work of the Committee was not affected. Views were expressed, in particular, that the quantum of resources, whether from the programme budget or from extrabudgetary sources, could not be the basis on which the programme evaluation was or was not to be carried out.

5. The view was expressed that the non-submission of the requested report had to be seen in the context of the issues raised in another report on evaluation currently before the Committee (A/68/70), which highlighted the "lack of an evaluation culture" in the Organization. The view was also expressed that no entity of the United Nations fell outside the need to improve.

6. Some delegations saw the need to reiterate the existing mandate for the report to be submitted, while other delegations expressed the view that that was not necessary, as the existing mandate remained valid and must be complied with.

7. The Chairman summarized the procedural concerns raised by delegations during the discussion regarding the deviation of the contents of the report from what had been sought by the General Assembly and elaborated on a number of options as a way forward. Moreover, given the delicate situation as well as having recognized that delegations needed time to thoroughly review and discuss, among themselves, the way forward, the Chairman indicated he would provide time for delegations to formulate appropriate conclusions and recommendations to the Assembly.

8. A view was expressed regarding the evaluation capacity at UNHCR, in particular that evaluations should be conducted by qualified staff and should show value for money. A view was also expressed generally accepting the recommendations contained in the report.

Conclusions and recommendations

9. **The Committee was deeply concerned that the required programme evaluation report on UNHCR, as mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/8, had not been submitted to the Committee.**

10. **The Committee was also concerned about the lack of UNHCR cooperation with OIOS. Equally, the Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the fact that, in the absence of the ability to prepare the mandated report, OIOS had not sought further guidance on that problem and instead had prepared and submitted to the Committee an alternative report for which it had no specific mandate.**

11. **The Committee was further concerned that, despite the provisions on inspection and evaluation contained in General Assembly resolution 48/218 B, it was only upon the discussion of the issue in the Committee that UNHCR had agreed to cooperate with OIOS for a programme evaluation.**

12. **The Committee strongly recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to entrust OIOS with conducting, as soon as possible, the required programme evaluation, pursuant to the above-mentioned resolution, and to submit the report to the Committee for Programme and Coordination during its fifty-fifth session in 2015. The report entitled "Review of the evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" (E/AC.51/2013/5) would be considered in conjunction.**